

Lead Entity Advisory Group

March 14, 2004

Seatac, WA

Summary Notes

| | |
|---|---|
| LEAG Attendance: | Scott Jungblom, Pend Oreille CD LE Kim Bredensteiner, Island County LE John Sims, Quinault Nation LE Doug Osterman, Green-Duwamish LE, Chair Jeff Breckel, Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board/LE |
| Others Present: | Roy Huberd, Pierce County LE Jim Fox, IAC/SRFB Brian Walsh, WDFW Kristi Lynett, WDFW Alan Chapman, Lummi Nation, WRIA 1 LE Jean White, WRIA 8 LE Mary Jorgenson, WRIA 8 LE Selinda Barkhuis, NOPL Richard Brocksmith, Hood Canal Coordinating Council LE Rollie Geppert, SRFB Jim Fox, SRFB Neil Aaland, SRFB Tim Smith, WDFW Sara LaBorde, WDFW |
| LEAG Members Absent: | Bill Towey, Okanogan County/Colville Tribes LE Steve Martin, Snake River Salmon Recovery Board/LE, Vice Chair Paul Dorn, Kitsap County LE |
| Approval of Agenda | The proposed agenda was discussed and approved. |
| Introduction/Chair Report | Brian Walsh will be stopping in for lunch so that we can provide him with the appropriate farewells and wishes. Brian has already started his new job at the Department of Ecology. A card was provided for all to sign to accompany his farewell gift from Walla Walla. |
| WDFW Report | Sara LaBorde has returned to WDFW after a two year absence and will be performing the pertinent duties of both Marnie Tyler (until she returns in July) and Brian Walsh. Brian's position will be re-evaluated and filled upon Marnie's return. Kristi will only be working 50% time for the Lead Entity Program as she is taking on other department priorities (sustainability and resource conservation coordination). |
| SSB 5610 Discussion and Decision | The amended SSB 5610 was discussed. Doug Osterman overviewed the major provisions of the substitute senate bill, pointed out the differences of the bill from the original senate bill, and what the bill meant to Lead Entities. The provisions of the bill that retain the strong relationship between Lead Entities and the SRFB |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>(keeping project implementation local) and create block grants were strongly supported. Concern was raised that the bill was not clear about funding to Lead Entities that are not planning within a regional recovery region. Tim Smith pointed out that WDFW supports the amended bill with no further changes.</p> <p><i>After a significant amount of discussion to clarify bill language and intent, LEAG officially passed a motion supporting the legislation as written (3 yea [Doug Osterman, Kim Bredensteiner, and Scott Jungblom, 2 nay [Jeff Breckel and John Sims]).</i></p> <p><i>Doug Osterman testified on behalf of LEAG at the House Natural Resources, Ecology and Parks Committee hearing on SSB 5610 (March 22, 2005), providing the majority decision of LEAG.</i></p> |
| Update on LE Allocation Process for 2005-2007 | <p>Kristi reported that WDFW still intends to conduct a statewide evaluation of the LE funding for the next biennium beginning July 1, 2005. We will be hiring a consultant to help develop the scoring criteria and application and will use an interagency review team to score applications and determine funding levels. All Lead Entities will have the opportunity to provide comment and review of the draft criteria and application materials. This process will begin in April and conclude by May 31, 2005.</p> |
| SRFB 6th Funding Cycle Discussion and Decision | <p>Discussion centered on Draft #4 2005 (6th Round) Grant Cycle Chart (draft proposals) that was developed by IAC staff following the February meeting of the SRFB (see attached).</p> <p><i>Strategies:</i> LEAG recommended that Strategy Guidance be more clear and specific in order to help Lead Entities determine if they should revise their strategies (from the 2004 cycle) and, if so, target revisions to address concerns identified by the Review Panel. The feedback of the 2004 Review Panel should be used in making the clarifications to the 2005 Strategy Guidance.</p> <p><i>Strategy Review:</i> LEAG recommended that involvement of regional Technical Review Teams (where applicable) be used to inform evaluation of strategies, not for specific scoring of strategies.</p> <p><i>Project List:</i> LEAG agreed that Lead Entities should only submit a prioritized project list as its funding request, not entire or partial project portfolios.</p> <p><i>Project Review:</i> LEAG recommended, to avoid duplication of and conflict with local review efforts, that project lists be reviewed for "Fit of the List" to the strategies as was done in 2004 (and not by going back to the benefit of salmon and certainty of success criteria approach that was used prior to the 2004 cycle). As a companion to this recommendation, LEAG recommended that the Lead Entity's ratings and rankings of projects and project lists, respectively, be submitted with application materials (thereby enhancing quality assurance dialogue early in the funding cycle).</p> <p><i>Panel Structure:</i> LEAG concurred with the proposed make-up of the Review Panel, and confirmed that increased technical review capabilities early in the</p> |

| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| | <p>funding cycle would be of great assistance to Lead Entities.</p> <p>Panel Function: LEAG agreed with the proposed functions of the Review Panel.</p> <p>Allocation of Funds: LEAG recommended that funding allocation proposals (and the methodology used) be known in advance of the final decision meeting. LEAG endorsed the proposal for a “first increment” of funding and, moreover, that it be a MINIMUM of 35%; most Lead Entities expressed support for a higher percentage. The first increment formula used in the 2004 funding cycle was satisfactory to LEAG.</p> <p>Schedule: LEAG generally agreed with the proposed schedule, stressing the need for early communication of strategies to maximize efficiencies (for example, minimizing or eliminating the need for review meetings late in the process).</p> |
| Monitoring Forum Update | <p>Richard Brocksmith, LEAG’s representative on the Governor’s Monitoring Forum, gave an update on status and trends monitoring. He attended the quarterly Forum meeting in February at which the question of “What does the state need?” was wrestled with. Richard was particularly interested in how the Forum would include Lead Entities and Regions into the monitoring construct and how our monitoring needs will be addressed, if at all. An invitation-only workshop is proposed for April 13 and 14 (in Tacoma) to bring stakeholders together to discuss priorities and make recommendations to the Governor and the SRFB. All LEAG members were invited, but Richard suggested that other Lead Entity Coordinators contact him if they are interested in attending as he may be able to secure additional seats.</p> |
| NEXT MEETING | Not Yet Scheduled |